including specifically the term "high temperature", were considered indefinite and because the claims were viewed as including a narrow range limitation within a broad range limitation in the same claim.

In response thereto, applicants filed an Amendment dated June 24, 2005 which formally amended the pending claims to overcome their formal rejection.

Thereafter a Final Rejection dated October 7, 2005 issued in which pending claims 1-10 were again rejected on formal grounds under Section 112 because the term "high temperature" was still present in four of the claims (1, 7, 10 and 15).

In response to the Final Rejection, applicants filed an Amendment dated January 4, 2006, and received by the Patent Office January 6, 2006, which revised the claims by deleting the term "high temperature" from the claims in question (1, 7, 10 and 15), thereby overcoming the formality rejection of the claims set forth in the Final Rejection in its entirety, and placing this application in condition for allowance since the Amendment removed the term "high temperature" from claims 1, 7, 10 and 15.

The Advisory Action of March 15, 2006 refused to enter the Amendment filed January 6, 2006 because the Amendment "does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the Examiner believes that the prior art teaches and/or suggests the claimed invention."

No Office Action of record herein ever rejected any claim over the prior art. Each of the Office Actions dated March 28, 2005 and October 7, 2005 made reference to 11 U.S. patents and stated that they were "cited as of interest".

None of the communications received from the Examiner ever asserted that the prior art in any way anticipates or suggests the subject matter of any of claims 1-10.

A casual observation that the Examiner believes that the prior art teaches or suggests the claimed invention is an unsubstantiated expression of belief that cannot be the basis of a rejection over the prior art.

Since none of the claims have been rejected over the prior art, and since the Amendment filed January 6, 2006 overcomes the previous formality rejection of the claims, this application is in condition for allowance.

In view thereof, applicants request that this application be allowed and that a formal Notice of Allowance issue at an early date.

In the alternative, if the Examiner continues to believe that the claims are not patentable over the prior art, applicants request an Office Action which identifies the prior art which render the claims unpatentable and substantiates such a rejection so that applicants can respond thereto.

In addition, should such a substantive Office Action issue, applicants request that it be made non-final since that would be an entirely new ground of rejection that was never before mentioned and that was not necessitated by any action on the part of applicants.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at (415) 273-4730 (direct dial).

Respectfully submitted,

J. Georg Seka
Reg. No. 24,491

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, 8th Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: (415) 576-0200
Fax: (415) 576-0300
JGS:jhw
60732975 v1